

**MINUTES**  
**Mendocino College Academic Senate**  
**Thursday, April 5, 2018**  
**Room 1060, 12:30 – 2:00 p.m.**

<i>Call to Order</i>	Edington called the meeting to order at 12:37 pm
<i>Present</i>	Jason Edington, Rachel Donham (12:37 - 1:30), Nicholas Petti, Rhea Hollis, Conan McKay, Rodney Grisanti, and Catherine Indermill
<i>Absent</i>	Doug Browe, and Taylor Cannon,
<i>Guests</i>	Debra Polak, Ginny Buccelli (12:37 - 1:30), and Leslie Banta (12:57 - 1:20)
<i>Agenda Approval</i>	M/S/C (Petti/Donham) to approve the Agenda of April 5, 2018 without consideration of the minutes from March 15, 2018 move Election Update to the first discussion item
<i>Approval of Minutes</i>	M/S/C (Indermill/McKay) to approve the minutes from the March 1, 2018.
<i>Public Comment</i>	none
<i>President's Report</i>	Edington presented a written report and highlighted the proposed funding formula and the Guided Pathways Oversight Committee Planning. ( <b>Attachment 1</b> )
<i>Senator's Report</i>	McKay discussed a letter sent from President Julie Bruno of the State Academic Senate. ( <b>Attachment 2</b> )  The California Acceleration Project (CAP) is urging the local senates to vote against 9.02 S18, which is the task force recommendation. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges President Julie Bruno is urging the local senates to vote in favor of 9.02 S18.
<i>Committee Report</i>	none
<i>Action Items/ Old Business</i>	<b>1. Math and Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Recommendations:</b> Direct Senate President to vote in favor of the task force recommendation at upcoming ASCCC Plenary. Leslie Banta addressed the Senate. This resolution is in response to AB705 which bypasses faculty decisions in placement of students in English, Mathematics or Stem. The California Acceleration Project

(CAP) says there is no reason to place students anywhere but in a transfer level class immediately. The legislation (AB 705) states that schools have a year for students to take their transfer level courses. This resolution is presented as a possible way, not a required way, that local colleges can meet AB 705. Colleges would be free to use, modify or disregard this resolution.

Edington said that he is in full support of Resolution 9.02 S18. He added that the delegate (himself) needs to have leeway to change his vote should an amendment be included that would change the intentions of this resolution.

M/S/C (McKay/Indermill) to direct the Senate President (Edington) to vote in favor of the task force recommendation at the upcoming ASCCC plenary, unless an amendment is included that changes the intended results of this resolution.

**2. Guided Pathways Work Plan:** Update on the work plan for Phase One

The Guided Pathways plan has been sent in and we should expect feedback by May. The first meetings for the Guided Pathways Oversight Committee are being looked at for May and the ad hoc committee has the makeup of this oversight committee as the first item on their agenda.

Indermill discussed the budget for Guided Pathways. The amounts that Mendocino College will receive are:

Year 1: \$131,902,  
Year 2: \$158,283,  
Year 3: \$131,902,  
Year 4: \$52,761 and  
Year 5: \$52,761.

Polak discussed that all of the money for a year does not need to be spent in the year that it is designated. There can be carry over.

Discussion about constituent groups that have already had meetings about guided pathways already and how they are excited to work on this to enhance success for students.

The Senate needs to think about the oversight committee and how/who is involved on this committee. As new senators come on board we need to reiterate that Guided Pathways will be a big part of our job as faculty leaders.

Questions on how will the setup of the oversight committee candidates take place. “Can the list of candidates come back to the Academic Senate before it is a done deal?” The Academic Senate wants to be in agreement on the composition of the oversight committee. It is important to have a mix that represents the faculty body. There will be many other committees that interface with the Oversight Committee. This topic (Guided Pathways) will be on every Senate agenda for a long while. Edington added to be sure to continue to have this discussion with your constituents.

*Discussion Items/*

**1. Resolutions for Spring ASCCC Plenary:** Discussion on any resolution to help inform Senate President how to vote at Plenary. **(Attachment 3)**

The following resolutions were discussed and recommendations for voting were given for some resolutions:

- 17.02 S18 Increase Participatory Governance on Colleges’ Satellite Campuses
  - **vote yes**
- 9.04 S18 Effective Practices in Online Lab Science Courses
  - **vote yes**
- 13.03 S18 Research on Guided Pathways Outcomes in California
- 13.02 S18 Guided Pathways Handbook and Training
- 11.01S18 Adopt the Paper Ensuring Effective Online Education Programs: A Faculty Perspective
- 6.01 S18 Oppose Proposed Consolidation of Categorical Program Funding

**2. Full-Time Faculty Climate Survey:** Discussion of survey items with Senate (10+1) purview

Edington - at a faculty meeting it was asked, “What is the Senate doing to discuss these?” (Climate Survey) The answer is that the Academic Senate just saw these results once last month, and it is up for discussion at the next meeting. He asked if anyone had any feedback from their constituents.

A comment was made that some people did not take the survey due to feeling uncomfortable with the survey and its unknown anonymity.

The question was raised, “What options do we have?”

Indermill- We need to work within our governance structure and our committee structure to make our voices heard. Senators on each of the key decision making committees can address these issues within their committees. It is not in the current Academic Senate Bylaws to have a senator on each of the key decision-making committees, but this is something we have been discussing. By having a senator on the key committees, the issues can be brought back to the Academic Senate and the concern can then be addressed by the President and Vice-President with the appropriate committee chair. She added that we need to work collegially within the college process of committees. Edington added that the Senate President has a seat with the board of trustees Further, the Senate can put forth a resolution if needed. A question was raised asking if a resolution is only perceived as a bad thing. Indermill stated that resolutions are a very powerful tool and a way of starting a conversation.

The question was asked, “Will the more recent (Noel-Levits) survey give us more information and how will it fit in with this first survey?” There was speculation that the more recent survey, which was a district survey, is more valued. The question was raised, “What is the agenda for each survey?” No answer was given.

Indermill made a recommendation that the questions from the MCFT survey that have been identified as within the Academic Senate purview be looked at in terms of how they fit into committees. Edington will send out an email asking senators to address this.

### **3. Update on Committee Appointments for 2017-2019:** Overview and initial draft of committee appointments **(Attachment 4)**

Discussion- Concern was expressed over the potential loss of six senators for the next term. How will this affect the senate for next year? The Academic Senate should be the highest decision making committee and this is not what is happening now. We need to be more proactive.

### **4. Election Update:** Brief update and reminder of nominations/upcoming elections.

Discussion that the following areas and persons are up for their position at the end of the term.

- Mathematics- Indermill
- Science- Donham
- Visual and Performing Arts- Browe
- English LL – Petti
- Social Science – McKay
- Part Time - vacant

Discussion on realigning the discipline groups. The Academic Senate is open to realigning. Once the senators are seated we can realign these positions.

*Open Forum*

At the next faculty meeting on April 12 from 12:30 – 1:30 Edington, Indermill and McKay will not be present. Doug Browe will run the meeting. It was suggested the question that could be addressed with the faculty is, “What is the direction the faculty wants the Academic Senate to go?” This is in response to the statement about being more proactive. Edington will discuss this with Browe.

*Meeting adjourned*

Meeting adjourned at 2:03.

**Academic Senate Membership 2017/2018**

Jason Edington, President

Catherine Indermill, Vice President (Math)

Doug Browe (Fine & Performing Arts)

Rodney Grisanti (Social Science)

Rachel Donham (Science)

Taylor Cannon (PT Faculty Rep)

Conan McKay (Career & Technical Education)

Nicholas Petti (English, Library & Languages)

Rhea Hollis (Student Services, Learning Skills & Counseling)

## **ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

**April 5, 2018**

Respectfully submitted by Jason Edington, Academic Senate President

### **PBC**

PBC met on 4/3. We discussed the April revise budget which, while finding us a bit better off (-\$566,248) than the adopted budget (-\$948,704), and includes one-time expenditures of \$440,000, we are still looking at an ongoing structural deficit of \$149,000. President Reyes stated that this is much better than many other colleges in the state.

We also discussed the Funding Formula that the state is working on for Community Colleges as well as the effect of constituent groups working to ensure that we are heard and considered. President Reyes stated that he feels that through the work of the ASCCC, Classified Senate, and CEO group, things are changing and he is confident that the final outcome will be something that truly helps schools that are working hard to improve. While previous models showed that, often times, schools that are already doing well budget wise would receive more funding and schools that needed funding to overcome many of their challenges would be losing money, there seems to be optimism from the CEO group that this is changing to a more equitable formula.

Next was the Strategic Plan. We are discussing the way that we will approach the different goals that have come from this, which include things such as: Expanding and enhancing Guided Pathways, Removing barriers to success, Continuing to expand and improve engagement with k-12, Making Mendocino College the 'place to be' in the community, Working towards better collaboration among constituency groups, as well as a few other main topics. There will be some training with committee chairs coming up early Fall to help facilitate committees to look at how their work impacts and promotes the strategic plan. There was already discussion about this for Guided Pathways.

Janelle Bird presented the new forms, which will be available to be filled out online, which will allow us to request rooms, services, food, etc, for internal events. For example, requesting a meeting room will be done through this process, as will Teachers on Teaching, or the Latino Club lunch sale, etc. The goal is to centralize the planning process so that services are utilized efficiently. Further, there is hope that a true college event calendar can come from this as well! The forms will be due in May for priority. (If you need to request a meeting for the next week, you will still be able to with the forms.)

It was also announced that Debra Polak, pending board approval, has been hired as the new Vice President of Academic Affairs.

### **Guided Pathways**

The Guided Pathways Implementation Plan has been approved and forwarded on to the Chancellor's office. We should receive feedback on it by the beginning of May. In the meantime, Catherine and I will be meeting with Ulises Velasco, Debra Polak, Chris Olson, and hopefully a student, with the intention of forming the Guided Pathways Oversight Committee. The goal is to have the first iteration of this committee in place in time to have at least one meeting prior to the end of the semester. I will be joining Ulises on Friday at ASMC to request that ASMC consider creating a position whose focus is on Guided Pathways and student involvement in the college's planning processes.



## **51<sup>st</sup> FALL SESSION RESOLUTIONS**

***FOR DISCUSSION ON***

***THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 2018***

*Disclaimer: The enclosed resolutions do not reflect the position of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, its Executive Committee, or standing committees. They are presented for the purpose of discussion by the field, and to be debated and voted on by academic senate delegates at the Plenary Session on April 14, 2018.*

Resolutions Committee 2017-18

Ginni May, ASCCC Area A Representative (Chair)

Rebecca Eikey, ASCCC Area C Representative

Carrie Roberson, ASCCC North Representative

Geoffrey Dyer, Taft College, Area A

Leigh Anne Shaw, Skyline College, Area B

Michael Dighera, Rio Hondo College, Area C

Donna Greene, College of the Desert, Area D

## RESOLUTIONS PROCESS

In order to ensure that deliberations are organized, effective, and meaningful, the Academic Senate uses the following resolution procedure:

- Pre-session resolutions are developed by the Executive Committee (through its committees) and submitted to the pre-session Area Meetings for review.
- Amendments and new pre-session resolutions are generated in the Area Meetings.
- The Resolutions Committee meets to review all pre-session resolutions and combine, re-word, append, or render moot these resolutions as necessary.
- Members of the Senate meet during the session in topic breakouts and give thoughtful consideration to the need for new resolutions and/or amendments.
- After all Session presentations are finished each day, members meet during the resolutions breakouts to discuss the need for new resolutions and/or amendments. Each resolution or amendment must be submitted to the Resolutions Chair before the posted deadlines each day. There are also Area meetings at the Session for discussing, writing, or amending resolutions.
- New resolutions submitted on the second day of session are held to the next session unless the resolution is declared urgent.
- The Resolutions Committee meets again to review all resolutions and amendments and to combine, re-word, append, or render moot the resolutions as necessary.
- The resolutions re debated and voted upon in the general sessions on the last day of the Plenary Session.
- All appendices are available on the ASCCC website.

Prior to plenary session, it is each attendee's responsibility to read the following documents:

- Senate Delegate Roles and Responsibilities (link in Local Senates Handbook or click [here](#))
- Resolution Procedures (Part II in Resolutions Handbook)
- Resolution Writing and General Advice (Part III in Resolutions Handbook)

New delegates are strongly encouraged to attend the New Delegate Orientation on Thursday morning prior to the first breakout session.



## CONSENT CALENDAR

The resolutions that have been placed on the Consent Calendar 1) were believed to be noncontroversial, 2) do not potentially reverse a previous position, and 3) do not compete with another proposed resolution. Resolutions that meet these criteria and any subsequent clarifying amendments have been included on the Consent Calendar. To remove a resolution from the Consent Calendar, please see the Consent Calendar section of the *Resolutions Procedures for the Plenary Session*.

Consent Calendar resolutions and amendments are marked with an \*.  
Resolutions and amendments submitted on Thursday are marked with a +.  
Resolutions and amendments submitted on Friday are marked with a #.

- \*9.01 S18 Adopt the Paper *Effective Practices for Educational Program Development*
- \*13.02 S18 Guided Pathways Handbook and Training Manual
- \*13.03 S18 Research on Guided Pathways Outcomes in California

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>ACADEMIC SENATE</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.01	S18 Adopt the 2018-2023 ASCCC Strategic Plan.....	1
1.02	S18 Resolution Honoring Rich Hansen .....	1
<b>3.0</b>	<b>DIVERSITY AND EQUITY</b> .....	<b>2</b>
3.01	S18 Adopt the Paper <i>A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures</i> .....	2
<b>4.0</b>	<b>ARTICULATION AND TRANSFER</b> .....	<b>2</b>
4.01	S18 Develop a Paper on Effective Transfer Practices .....	2
<b>6.0</b>	<b>STATE AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES</b> .....	<b>3</b>
6.01	S18 Oppose Proposed Consolidation of Categorical Program Funding .....	3
6.02	S18 Opposition to the Proposed California Online Community College District 3	3
<b>7.0</b>	<b>CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE</b> .....	<b>4</b>
7.01	S18 Support Equity-Minded Funding That Relies on Locally Identified Goals	4
7.02	S18 Wrap-Around Services and Online Student Success.....	5
7.03	S18 Including Noncredit in All Student Success Statewide Initiatives .....	5
7.04	S18 Identifying Appropriate Assessment Measures .....	6
7.05	S18 Legal Interpretation of AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) .....	7
7.06	S18 Support Students’ Rights to Enroll in English as a Second Language (ESL) Coursework.....	8
7.07	S18 Maintain Language Placement Tests as a Multiple Measure Option for English as a Second Language (ESL).....	9
<b>9.0</b>	<b>CURRICULUM</b> .....	<b>10</b>
*9.01	S18 Adopt the Paper <i>Effective Practices for Educational Program Development</i> .....	10
9.02	S18 Pathways to Meet General Education Requirements of Quantitative Reasoning.....	10
9.03	S18 Effective Practices in Online Communication Courses.....	11
9.04	S18 Effective Practices in Online Lab Science Courses.....	12
<b>10.0</b>	<b>DISCIPLINES LIST</b> .....	<b>13</b>
10.01	S18 Revise the Disciplines List Revision Process .....	13
10.02	S18 Endorse Proposed Revisions to Apprenticeship Minimum Qualifications 13	13
<b>11.0</b>	<b>TECHNOLOGY</b> .....	<b>15</b>
11.01	S18 Adopt the Paper <i>Ensuring Effective Online Education Programs: A Faculty Perspective</i> .....	15
<b>13.0</b>	<b>GENERAL CONCERNS</b> .....	<b>15</b>
13.01	S18 Expanding Competency-Based Instruction through an Online Consortium.....	15
*13.02	S18 Guided Pathways Handbook and Training Manual.....	16

*13.03	S18 Research on Guided Pathways Outcomes in California .....	17
<b>17.0</b>	<b>LOCAL SENATES.....</b>	<b>17</b>
17.01	S18 Noncredit Instruction in Guided Pathways Efforts.....	17
17.02	S18 Increase Participatory Governance on Colleges' Satellite Campuses ...	18
<b>19.0</b>	<b>PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS.....</b>	<b>18</b>
19.01	S18 Faculty Involvement in Responding to Litigation or Student Complaints 18	
19.02	S18 Defining Collegiality in the Workplace.....	19

## **1.0 ACADEMIC SENATE**

### **1.01 S18 Adopt the 2018-2023 ASCCC Strategic Plan**

Whereas, Strategic planning is an important activity for any successful organization, as this activity provides clear direction and stability and ensures that the organization's leadership is responsive to its members;

Whereas, The initial draft of the strategic plan for the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) was created by the elected representatives of the ASCCC, the Executive Committee, with careful thought regarding the organization's mission and purpose as well as consideration of the ASCCC Executive Committee members' perceptions of the wishes of faculty statewide and with attention to the future health and growth of the ASCCC; and

Whereas, The current Strategic Plan of the ASCCC expires in 2018;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the 2018-2023 ASCCC Strategic Plan<sup>1</sup>.

Contact: Executive Committee

### **1.02 S18 Resolution Honoring Rich Hansen**

Whereas, Rich Hansen ably served the California Community Colleges for more than two decades as a faculty member in the De Anza mathematics department, the president of the Foothill-De Anza Faculty Association, and the president and treasurer of the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges;

Whereas, Rich Hansen was first and foremost an advocate of students, always reminding those who worked with him that students must be at the center of everything we do;

Whereas, Rich Hansen represented faculty with distinction alongside Academic Senate for California Community Colleges representatives on the Student Success Task Force as well as all three California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Accreditation Task Forces;

Whereas, Rich Hansen is a team player whose calm and logical reasoning style won the respect of his colleagues as well as a wide range of other constituents involved in state level policy-making; and

Whereas, The fact that Rich Hansen taught mathematics did not cancel out the fact that his undergraduate degree was in history, and he always had historical perspective in mind, leading to his work on the ASCCC History Project as well as his willingness to work on the Accreditation History Project;

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/ASCCC%20Strategic%20Plan%202018-2021%20for%20Area%20Meetings%20Discussion.pdf>

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges thank Rich Hansen for his leadership, service, and contributions to the California Community College system and to the field; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges wish Rich Hansen a negotiation-free retirement.

Contact: Foothill-DeAnza District Academic Senate, Area B

### **3.0 DIVERSITY AND EQUITY**

#### **3.01 S18 Adopt the Paper A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures**

Whereas, Resolution 3.01 S17 directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to “update the paper *A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures* and bring it to the Spring 2018 Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures*<sup>2</sup> and disseminate to local senates and curriculum committees upon its adoption.

Contact: Dolores Davison, Equity and Diversity Action Committee

### **4.0 ARTICULATION AND TRANSFER**

#### **4.01 S18 Develop a Paper on Effective Transfer Practices**

Whereas, California Education Code, Title 5 regulations, local policies and procedures, and restrictions placed on colleges by the California State University (CSU), the University of California (UC), independent institutions and out-of-state institutions result in a wide variety of transfer practices and standards around the state leading to confusion among colleges as well as the exclusion and inequitable treatment of transfer-bound students across the system; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has numerous resolutions in support of transfer opportunities for students such as Resolution 4.01 F17 “Support Students Transferring to UC, CSU, and Private and Out-of-State Institutions”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a paper identifying effective practices around transfer to assist colleges to create and apply uniform and equitable transfer policies and bring the paper to the Fall 2019 Plenary Session for adoption.

Contact: Executive Committee

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Hiring%20Paper%20Final%203.12.18.pdf>

## **6.0 STATE AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES**

### **6.01 S18 Oppose Proposed Consolidation of Categorical Program Funding**

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office recently distributed a survey<sup>3</sup> to the system about the consolidation of categorical programs to prepare a proposal for the May revision to the Governor's 2018-19 budget proposal;

Whereas, Categorical programs were established to guarantee support services and open access to students with disabilities and students who are educationally and financially disadvantaged;

Whereas, Consolidation of categorical program funding could easily result in a reduction of services for the colleges' most marginalized and disproportionately impacted students; and

Whereas, Each categorical program requires continued funding so that colleges comply with state and federal directives;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose any consolidation of categorical programs' funds because it diminishes the colleges' ability to meet their commitment to student success; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges continue to advocate for the protection of marginalized groups.

Contact: Josh Ashenmiller, Fullerton College, Area D

### **6.02 S18 Opposition to the Proposed California Online Community College District**

Whereas, The proposed California Online Community College District represents an investment in a new enterprise that expands the scope of the work of the California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) such that a regulatory agency tasked with ensuring the compliance of the colleges with regulation and law would be in competition with the colleges by potentially drawing students away from existing California community college districts and puts limited state educational resources into duplicating efforts already underway;

Whereas, Title 5 §53200 defines academic and professional matters to include degree and certificate requirements and educational program development, and the trailer bill language for the California Online Community College District offers no assurance that curriculum and programs will be developed by the faculty experts<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/February%2028%202018%20Memo%20.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> [http://dof.ca.gov/Budget/Trailer\\_Bill\\_Language/documents/CCC-CaliforniaOnlineCommunityCollege.pdf](http://dof.ca.gov/Budget/Trailer_Bill_Language/documents/CCC-CaliforniaOnlineCommunityCollege.pdf)

Whereas, Title 5 §53203 requires “the governing board or its designees will consult collegially with the academic senate when adopting policies and procedures on academic and professional matters,” and the proposed governance structure for California Online Community College District offers no assurance of an effective academic senate; and

Whereas, The California Online Community College District “shall seek accreditation and meet requirements for students to become eligible for federal and state financial aid,” yet students of the new California Online Community College District will be ineligible for many years before the California Online Community College District is accredited;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges strongly urge the California Community College Chancellor’s Office and legislature to make more efficient use of state educational resources by utilizing the existing community college districts and expertise as opposed to creating a new California Online Community College District.

Contact: Wendy Brill-Wynkoop, College of the Canyons, Area C

## **7.0 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE**

### **7.01 S18 Support Equity-Minded Funding That Relies on Locally Identified Goals**

Whereas, The 2018-2019 Governor’s Budget Trailer Bill Language (February 20, 2018) proposes a new “student centered” college funding formula with metrics<sup>5</sup> including the number of disadvantaged students and number of completions that may result in competition among the 114 California community colleges for funds;

Whereas, The proposed performance-based model funding is in disagreement with Academic Senate for California Community Colleges positions opposing performance-based funding models, including Resolution 5.01 S11 on success-based metrics that asserts “that any such proposed funding modifications should be additive and above base funding;” and

Whereas, The proposed funding formula in the 2018-2019 Governor’s Budget Trailer Bill Language (February 20, 2018) calls for system-wide consultation in developing criteria and standards for making the annual budget requests;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office and system partners to establish equity-minded funding approaches that rely primarily on progress toward locally identified goals while ensuring access for all students and maintaining instructional quality and rigor.

---

<sup>5</sup> pp 2-5: [http://dof.ca.gov/Budget/Trailer\\_Bill\\_Language/documents/CCC-CommunityCollegeStudent-FocusedApportionmentsFormula.pdf](http://dof.ca.gov/Budget/Trailer_Bill_Language/documents/CCC-CommunityCollegeStudent-FocusedApportionmentsFormula.pdf)

Contact: Executive Committee

### **7.02 S18 Wrap-Around Services and Online Student Success**

Whereas, The 2018-2019 Governor's Budget Trailer Bill Language (February 23, 2018) calls for creation of a new California Online Community College District for "working adults to access high-quality, affordable and flexible opportunities to pursue postsecondary education that does not conflict with their work and familial obligations";

Whereas, The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges requires that student support services comparable to those for face-to-face students exist for students taking courses online;

Whereas, Numerous studies have demonstrated that students taking online courses require significant support services, to the point that the Online Education Initiative (OEI) states on its "Student Success" homepage<sup>6</sup> that "increasing student success involves many aspects of student support beyond that provided by the classroom instructor"; and

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, in its most recent online education report<sup>7</sup> makes it clear that the growth of online courses and programs, "creates new challenges for colleges that must now provide student services and other support in a virtual world";

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to support wrap-around student services<sup>8</sup> as an essential component for the success of online students.

Contact: Executive Committee

### **7.03 S18 Including Noncredit in All Student Success Statewide Initiatives**

Whereas, Career Development and College Preparation noncredit instruction serves as an integral part of current and future student success efforts by providing pathways to college credit programs that lead to completion of degree and certificate programs in transfer and Career and Technical Education programs for students who are unprepared or underprepared for college; and

Whereas, Student success initiatives such as the Guided Pathways Award Program and Student Equity did not explicitly identify noncredit programs as integral components of such student success efforts;

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://ccconlineed.org/student-success-resources/>

<sup>7</sup> Page 16:

[http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/portals/0/reportstb/report\\_distanceeducation2013\\_090313.pdf](http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/portals/0/reportstb/report_distanceeducation2013_090313.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Wraparound-Services-05142013.pdf>



Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to explicitly identify noncredit programs as integral components of all current and future student success efforts, including the guided pathways frameworks colleges are working to develop and implement; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and system partners to ensure the inclusion of noncredit allocation in the initial release of statewide initiatives and include provisions allowing colleges and districts to include noncredit programs in their planning and implementation efforts.

Contact: Curtis Martin, Noncredit Committee, Modesto Junior College

#### **7.04 S18 Identifying Appropriate Assessment Measures**

Whereas, California Education Code §66010.4 (a)(2)(A) stipulates that community colleges shall offer “remedial instruction for those in need of it”;

Whereas, Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and standards or policies regarding student preparation and success fall under the purview of local academic senates as academic and professional matters per Title 5 §53200, and as such administrators should defer to the expertise of discipline faculty and the academic senate to develop placement models that comply with all legal requirements, and that may include some courses in remediation for students who need it;

Whereas, AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) states that “‘assessment’ means the process of gathering information about a student regarding the student’s study skills, English language proficiency, computational skills, aptitudes, goals, learning skills, career aspirations, academic performance, and need for special services. Assessment methods may include, but not necessarily be limited to, interviews, standardized tests, attitude surveys, vocational or career aptitude and interest inventories, high school or postsecondary transcripts, specialized certificates or licenses, educational histories, and other measures of performance”, thus an assessment instrument used along with other measures for assisting students will help students make informed decisions regarding how to begin and successfully complete their mathematics, reading, writing, and/or ESL sequences; and

Whereas, California Education Code §78213 2(c) stipulates that “The Board of Governors shall establish an advisory committee to review and make recommendations concerning all assessment instruments used by districts and colleges” as one component of a multiple measures placement model;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) and other stakeholders to ensure the right and responsibility of local academic senates to work with discipline faculty to use appropriate assessment instruments, as part of a multiple measures

placement process, to help students make informed decisions as to how to begin and complete their mathematics, reading, writing, and/or ESL sequences;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert the right and responsibility of individual California community colleges to make the local decisions to continue to offer appropriate classes below transfer level in mathematics, reading, writing, and ESL for those students that prefer to take a more measured approach to their education or need some remediation to ensure success at the transfer level; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request that the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office convene the Chancellor's Office Assessment Workgroup required by Title 5 §78213 2(c) and rely primarily upon recommendations of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.

Contact: Gayle Pitman, Sacramento City College, Area A

#### **7.05 S18 Legal Interpretation of AB 705 (Irwin, 2017)**

Whereas, The changes to California Education Code Section §78213(d)(1)(E) resulting from the passage of AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) stipulate regarding multiple measures that “The board of governors may establish regulations governing the use of these and other measures, instruments, and placement models to ensure that the measures, instruments, and placement models selected by a community college demonstrate that they guide English and mathematics placements to achieve the goal of maximizing the probability that a student will enter and complete transfer-level coursework in English and mathematics within a one-year timeframe and credit ESL students will complete transfer-level coursework in English within a timeframe of three years”; and

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office has released AB 705 guidelines for English placement<sup>9</sup> and will soon be releasing guidelines for math placement, although no regulations have been established, and genuine and meaningful collegial consultation with the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges as the legally recognized voice of faculty in academic and professional matters has not occurred;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with system partners, as appropriate, to seek a legal opinion to determine whether or not AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) allows students to be placed into courses below transfer-level if local faculty determine, based on local research, that these students would be best served by such placement.

Contact: Troy Myers, Sacramento City College, Area A

---

<sup>9</sup> [https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/English705Guidance\\_CCCCO\\_03\\_22\\_18.pdf](https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/English705Guidance_CCCCO_03_22_18.pdf)

## **7.06 S18 Support Students' Rights to Enroll in English as a Second Language (ESL) Coursework**

Whereas, AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) rightfully distinguishes English as a Second Language (ESL) students as “foreign language learners who require additional language training in English” with needs separate from those of native English speakers in California Community College English pathways, and therefore intentionally provides English language learners (ELLs) in credit ESL with up to three years to achieve language proficiency before being mainstreamed into native-speaker transfer-level English;

Whereas, The pathway to academic proficiency in English is not identical for every student and is dependent upon length of time and quality instruction at an appropriate level as well as additional factors far beyond the control of the classroom;

Whereas, The Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP) has the potential to be applied in such a manner as to sweep high school ELLs into transfer-level English despite not having spent sufficient time in English language learning and despite the fact that GPAs of ELLs from the varied and inconsistent ESL models across California high schools (which include sheltered, pull-out, inclusion, transitional bilingual, structured immersion, and others<sup>10</sup>) may not accurately predict success in the same way as with their native-speaking cohorts; and

Whereas, While some high school senior ELLs may indeed be ready for mainstreaming into transfer-level English, credit ESL at the community college is designed to enhance proficiency in English at a level of academic rigor that can better serve many ELLs who may have completed three or four years of high school English in the United States but whose language proficiency may still require attention to specific needs that are not met in transfer-level English, even with co-requisite or other support;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and the AB 705 Implementation Committee and Work Groups to ensure that students who will be best served by credit academic ESL courses be distinguished in the implementation of AB 705 (Irwin, 2017); and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and ESL professionals to ensure that MMAP placement options provide ample opportunity for ELLs to know their rights to enroll in credit academic ESL coursework that may better ensure their success in pursuing their transfer and career goals.

Contact: Leigh Anne Shaw, Skyline College, Area B

---

<sup>10</sup> Rennie, Jeanne. 1993. *ESL and Bilingual Program Models*. ERIC Digest: ED362072. Accessed March 14, 2018. <<https://www.ericdigests.org/1994/esl.htm>>

**7.07 S18 Maintain Language Placement Tests as a Multiple Measure Option for English as a Second Language (ESL)**

Whereas, AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) stipulates that “Colleges shall use evidence-based multiple measures for placing students into English-as-a-second-language (ESL) coursework. For those students placed into credit ESL coursework, their placement should maximize the probability that they will complete degree and transfer requirements in English within three years”;

Whereas, AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) also states that “Instruction in English as a second language (ESL) is distinct from remediation in English. Students enrolled in ESL credit coursework are foreign language learners who require additional language training in English [and] require support to successfully complete degree and transfer requirements in English”;

Whereas, The purpose of language placement assessments for ESL, as with all foreign languages, is to align a language-learning curriculum with the needs of a language learner in order to maximize success in achieving language proficiency;

Whereas, AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) states that “‘assessment’ means the process of gathering information about a student regarding the student’s study skills, English language proficiency, computational skills, aptitudes, goals, learning skills, career aspirations, academic performance, and need for special services. Assessment methods may include, but not necessarily be limited to, interviews, standardized tests, attitude surveys, vocational or career aptitude and interest inventories, high school or postsecondary transcripts, specialized certificates or licenses, educational histories, and other measures of performance”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office and the Board of Governors as the approving body of all placement instruments to refrain from disallowing all placement instruments as a multiple measure; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office and the Board of Governors to ensure that credit ESL departments are afforded the opportunity to provide language proficiency assessment via multiple measures that may include quality standardized assessment tests for the purpose of aligning college language-learning curriculum with the needs of the English language learners who seek English proficiency at the advanced post-secondary level.

Contact: Leigh Anne Shaw, Skyline College, Area B

## **9.0 CURRICULUM**

### **\*9.01 S18 Adopt the Paper *Effective Practices for Educational Program Development***

Whereas, Resolution 9.02 S16 directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to “develop a paper on effective practices for developing and revising all educational programs and bring the paper to the Spring 2017 Plenary Session for approval”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Effective Practices for Educational Program Development*<sup>11</sup> and disseminate to local senates and curriculum committees upon its adoption.

Contact: Randy Beach, Educational Policies Committee

### **9.02 S18 Pathways to Meet General Education Requirements of Quantitative Reasoning**

Whereas, The California State University (CSU), through CSU Executive Order 1100 no longer requires that a course included in CSU General Education Breadth Area B4, Quantitative Reasoning, has an explicit prerequisite of intermediate algebra;

Whereas, AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) requires that “a community college district or college shall maximize the probability that a student will enter and complete transfer-level coursework in... mathematics within a one-year timeframe” and “for students who seek a goal other than transfer, and who are in certificate or degree programs with specific requirements that are not met with transfer-level coursework, a community college district or college maximizes the probability that a student will enter and complete the required college-level coursework in... mathematics within a one-year timeframe” and mathematics is a required component of all quantitative reasoning courses;

Whereas, Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites, degree and certificate requirements, educational program development, and standards or policies regarding student preparation and success fall under the purview of local academic senates as academic and professional matters as per the “10+1” in Title 5 §53200, and, as such, administrators should defer to the expertise of the academic senate to develop curricular pathways and placement models that serve the needs of students while complying with all legal requirements; and

Whereas, In fall 2017, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC), the California Mathematics Council of Community Colleges (CMC<sup>3</sup>) and the California Mathematics Council of Community Colleges-South (CMC<sup>3</sup>-South) joined together and formed a task force to address math and quantitative reasoning education in California community colleges and has provided the California Community Colleges

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Effective%20Practices%20Paper%203.12.18.pdf>

Math and Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Recommendations – Part I<sup>12</sup> as options for colleges to consider in moving toward compliance with AB 705 (Irwin, 2017);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recognize multiple pathways for students to achieve transfer-level competency in math and quantitative reasoning; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges endorse the California Community Colleges Math and Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Recommendations – Part I as one option that colleges may consider as they implement changes related to AB 705 (Irwin, 2017).

Contact: Executive Committee

### **9.03 S18 Effective Practices in Online Communication Courses**

Whereas, California Code of Regulations Title 5 §55202 states that distance education courses must adhere to the “same standards of course quality” as traditional classroom courses and that determinations of course standards and quality must be made “with the full involvement of faculty,” and given that the separate course review and approval of distance education courses required by Title 5 §55206 maintains districts’ local authority to determine if courses will “be provided through distance education”;

Whereas, California State University (CSU) Executive Order 1100, section 3.2 states “GE requirements may be satisfied through courses taught in all modalities” including “completely online,”<sup>13</sup> and many speech and oral communication classes offered by California community colleges satisfy the A1 Oral Communication requirement of the CSU-Breadth Pattern for General Education;

Whereas, For-profit colleges, CSU campuses, and some California community colleges currently offer communication courses, including public speaking, online; and

Whereas, Many students endeavor to achieve their degrees, including Associate Degrees for Transfer to CSU, completely online, and restricting online course offerings for general education requirements creates a barrier to these students’ success and transfer guarantees;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges through its discipline expert lists and discipline-specific state associations identify and disseminate effective and promising practice to teaching oral communication courses online.

Contact: Geoffrey Dyer, Taft College, Area A

---

<sup>12</sup> <https://asccc.org/events/2018-04-12-150000-2018-04-14-230000/2018-spring-plenary-session-0> (click on Resolutions) or <https://asccc.org/directory/math-and-quantitative-reasoning-task-force>.

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1100-rev-8-23-17.html>

#### **9.04 S18 Effective Practices in Online Lab Science Courses**

Whereas, California Code of Regulations Title 5 §55202 states that distance education courses must adhere to the “same standards of course quality” as traditional classroom courses and that determinations of course standards and quality must be made “with the full involvement of faculty,” and given that the separate course review and approval of distance education courses required by Title 5 §55206 maintains districts’ local authority to determine if courses will “be provided through distance education”;

Whereas, California State University (CSU) Executive Order 1100, section 3.2 states “GE requirements may be satisfied through courses taught in all modalities” including “completely online,”<sup>14</sup> and most lab science classes offered by California community colleges satisfy the B3 Laboratory Activity requirement of the CSU-Breadth Pattern for General Education, with the 1 unit laboratory activity requirement often embedded into a course meeting the requirements for B1 Physical Science or B2 Life Science;

Whereas, For-profit colleges, CSU campuses, and some California community colleges currently offer science courses, including lab sciences, online, and proposed Education Trailer Bill language (February 13, 2018, Dept. of Finance) includes a proposal to establish the California Educational Learning Laboratory with the purpose of increasing outcomes and closing achievement gaps “using learning science and adaptive learning technologies in online and hybrid college-level lower division courses in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM)”<sup>15</sup>; and

Whereas, Many students endeavor to achieve their degrees, including Associate Degrees for Transfer to CSU, completely online, and restricting online course offerings for general education requirements creates a barrier to these students’ success and transfer guarantees;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges engage science faculty through its discipline expert lists and discipline-specific state associations to make recommendations regarding lab science courses most adaptable to online instruction without compromising student outcomes related to laboratory practices necessary for upper division study or employment and disseminate its findings; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges through its discipline expert lists and discipline-specific state associations identify and disseminate effective and promising practice to teaching appropriate laboratory courses online.

Contact: Cheryl Aschenbach, Lassen College, Area A

---

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1100-rev-8-23-17.html>

<sup>15</sup>

[http://www.dof.ca.gov/Budget/Trailer\\_Bill\\_Language/documents/CaliforniaEducationLearningLab\\_001.pdf](http://www.dof.ca.gov/Budget/Trailer_Bill_Language/documents/CaliforniaEducationLearningLab_001.pdf)

## **10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST**

### **10.01 S18 Revise the Disciplines List Revision Process**

Whereas, The original Disciplines List was approved in 1989, with many of the discipline minimum qualifications having remained unchanged since its original publication;

Whereas, Multiple issues with the clarity of the minimum qualifications for disciplines have arisen over time, including changes to the names of degrees, the order of degree names, punctuation issues, and the lack of consistent clarity provided for the appropriate application of the disciplines not requiring a master's degree; and

Whereas, The process to revise the Disciplines List occurs annually, but requires proposals to revise existing disciplines and add new disciplines to originate from the field through local senates or discipline organizations, which may result in the lack of a consistent and thorough review of the discipline minimum qualifications;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges revise the Disciplines List Revision Process in order that the Disciplines List is updated to ensure that the minimum qualifications for all disciplines are current and provide clarity to the field; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges convene a task force to initiate a complete and thorough review of the Disciplines List for the purpose of engaging discipline faculty to update and clarify all faculty minimum qualifications.

Contact: John Freitas, Standards and Practices Committee, Executive Committee

### **10.02 S18 Endorse Proposed Revisions to Apprenticeship Minimum Qualifications**

Whereas, The delegates at the Fall 2017 Plenary Session approved Resolution 10.01 F17 which calls for the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to “continue efforts to engage in sustained and respectful dialog and collaboration with the Department of Industrial Relations, the California Apprenticeship Council, and the broader apprenticeship community to provide the highest quality educational experiences in all apprenticeship programs offered by the California Community Colleges”;

Whereas, Representatives of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and representatives of the California Apprenticeship Council engaged in sustained and respectful dialog and reached agreement on the following revisions to the minimum qualifications for credit apprenticeship instructors stated in Title 5 §53413:

*(a) The minimum qualifications for service as an ~~community college faculty member~~ apprenticeship instructor teaching community college credit apprenticeship courses that are part of an apprenticeship program approved by the Division of Apprenticeship Standards shall be satisfied by meeting one of the following two requirements:*



*(1) Possession of an associate degree, plus four years of occupational experience in the subject matter area to be taught; or*

*(2) Six years of occupational experience in the subject matter to be taught, a journeyman's certificate in the subject matter area to be taught, and completion of at least ~~eighteen (18)~~ twelve (12) semester units of ~~degree-applicable apprenticeship or college level course work, in addition to apprenticeship credits.~~*

*(A) This last requirement may be satisfied concurrently during the first two (2) years of employment as an apprenticeship instructor.*

*(3) Six years of occupational experience in the subject matter to be taught, and having served as an apprenticeship instructor for an apprenticeship program approved by the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Apprenticeship Standards for a minimum of ten years;*

*(4) The Board of Trustees of a community college district in consultation with their local academic senate and the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Apprenticeship Standards may adopt policies to authorize a person to serve as an apprenticeship instructor to teach credit apprenticeship courses in an urgency condition.*

*(A) "Urgency condition" is defined as: A shortage of qualified instructors that would prevent offering classes to students in accordance with the approved education plan for the apprenticeship program adopted by the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Apprenticeship Standards.*

*(B) Each instructor hired under this urgency provision must meet the educational requirements of either subdivision (a)(1) or (a)(2) above within two years provided that the instructor possesses:*

*1. Six (6) years of occupational experience in the subject matter to be taught, and a journeyman's certificate in the subject matter area to be taught; or*

*2. Four (4) years of occupational experience in the subject matter to be taught, and is within one (1) year of completing an associate's degree.*

*(C) Until the education requirements are completed, each instructor approved under the provisions of this subdivision shall be employed as a temporary instructor.*

*(b) The minimum qualifications for service as a ~~community college faculty member~~ apprenticeship instructor teaching Community College noncredit apprenticeship courses that are part of an apprenticeship program approved by the Division of Apprenticeship Standards shall be either of the following:*

*(1) The minimum qualifications for credit apprenticeship instruction as set forth in this section, or*

*(2) A high school diploma; and six years of occupational experience in the occupation to be taught, including at least two years at the journeyman level; and sixty clock hours or four semester units in materials, methods, and evaluation of instruction. This last requirement may be satisfied concurrently during the first year of employment as an apprenticeship instructor; and*

Whereas, At its January 25, 2018 meeting the California Apprenticeship Council approved recommending to the Board of Governors the revised credit apprenticeship minimum qualifications; and

Whereas, The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges voted at its February 2-3, 2018 meeting to support the proposed revisions to the credit apprenticeship minimum qualifications prior to the February 2018 Consultation Council meeting;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the revisions to the minimum qualifications for credit apprenticeship instructors stated in Title 5 §53413 as approved by the California Apprenticeship Council and supported by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and urge approval of the revisions by the Board of Governors.

Contact: Executive Committee

## **11.0 TECHNOLOGY**

### **11.01 S18 Adopt the Paper *Ensuring Effective Online Education Programs: A Faculty Perspective***

Whereas, Resolution 11.01 S16 directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to “provide guidance to local senates and colleges on best practices in online education programs, update the 2008 paper *Ensuring the Appropriate Use of Educational Technology: An Update for Local Academic Senates*”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Ensuring Effective Online Education Programs: A Faculty Perspective*<sup>16</sup> and disseminate to local senates and curriculum committees upon its adoption.

Contact: Conan McKay, Online Education Committee

## **13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS**

### **13.01 S18 Expanding Competency-Based Instruction through an Online Consortium**

Whereas, The 2018-2019 Governor’s Budget Trailer Bill Language (February 20, 2018) calls for creation of a new California Online Community College District for “working adults to access high-quality, affordable and flexible opportunities to pursue postsecondary education that does not conflict with their work and familial obligations”;

Whereas, The faculty in the California Community College system (CCC) recognize the urgent need for expansion of career technical curriculum offering nontraditional programs focusing on competency-based education that lead to industry recognized

---

<sup>16</sup> <https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/OE%20Paper%20Final%203.12.18.pdf>

credentials, and many of the CCC districts already offer skilled-based, stackable certificates in program pathways identified by the California Community College Chancellor's Office;

Whereas, The student population identified for the new California Online Community College District has a significantly wider success gap in the online learning modality<sup>17</sup> and therefore would benefit from access to local on campus student support services; and

Whereas, The primary focus of competency-based education is skills development and demonstration, and students would benefit from local access to physical laboratory space and equipment to practice skills relevant to their online education;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges create a task force that includes participation from system partners to explore the design and implementation of online, competency-based instruction by leveraging local resources and utilizing existing talent through a consortium-based approach; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges engage with system partners to explore the feasibility of leveraging local resources and talent at colleges accessible to online consortium students to provide on-campus student support services and physical laboratory space regardless of the location of the teaching college.

Contact: Executive Committee

**\*13.02 S18 Guided Pathways Handbook and Training Manual**

Whereas, Guided pathways represents an opportunity for the 114 colleges to examine student success, identify invisible barriers accumulated in our institutions and in California's higher education system, and create clear messaging for our students to successfully complete their own educational goals;

Whereas, Faculty participation is essential to a process that builds on and rigorously examines our ability to deliver services and enable students to complete programs of study; and

Whereas, Participatory governance is the vehicle to transform institutions in a sustainable and scalable manner;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges create a handbook of actions local academic senates can use as examples to promote inquiry at their colleges and modify existing practices through participatory governance; and

---

<sup>17</sup> Jagers (2011). Online Learning: Does It Help Low-Income and Underprepared Students? Community College Research Center Working Paper No.

26. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED515135.pdf>

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges distribute these materials in a variety of appropriate venues.

Contact: Janet Fulks, ASCCC Guided Pathways Task Force, Area A

**\*13.03 S18 Research on Guided Pathways Outcomes in California**

Whereas, Guided pathways represents an opportunity for California community colleges to carefully examine and transform institutional practices;

Whereas, Recent legislative mandates and external pressures may create an environment of rapid change<sup>18</sup>; and

Whereas, Faculty are responsible to maintain rigor and quality of curriculum, programs and student success;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with guided pathways liaisons, local academic senates, and system partners to immediately examine needs for change, areas where change has been implemented, and data associated with shifts in practice and report the findings to the field by December 2018.

Contact: Janet Fulks, ASCCC Guided Pathways Task Force, Area A

**17.0 LOCAL SENATES**

**17.01 S18 Noncredit Instruction in Guided Pathways Efforts**

Whereas, Career Development and College Preparation noncredit courses that are part of approved noncredit certificates are eligible for apportionment at the same apportionment rate as credit courses; and

Whereas, Career Development and College Preparation noncredit courses provide valuable opportunities that prepare students who are unprepared or underprepared for college-level coursework for entry into the workforce, and provide onramps into credit certificate and degree programs;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recognize the importance of Career Development and College Preparation noncredit instruction as a

---

<sup>18</sup> Examples:

(705 creates pressure to act quick . . .)

[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201720180AB705](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB705)

(The vision)

<http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/Reports/vision-for-success.pdf>

(CA GP itself)

<http://cccgp.cccco.edu/>

(Info on proposed budget model)

[http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/CFFP/Fiscal\\_Services/Fiscal%20Affairs/CommunityCollegesFundingModelRecommendationwithdisclaimer.pdf](http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/CFFP/Fiscal_Services/Fiscal%20Affairs/CommunityCollegesFundingModelRecommendationwithdisclaimer.pdf)

valuable tool for serving unprepared and underprepared students as part of college guided pathways efforts; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide guidance to local senates on the effective use of Career Development and College Preparation noncredit instruction in guided pathways planning and implementation efforts.

Contact: Donna Necke, Noncredit Committee, Mt. San Antonio College

### **17.02 S18 Increase Participatory Governance on Colleges' Satellite Campuses**

Whereas, "Effective participation" means that all stakeholders must be afforded an opportunity to review and comment upon recommendations, proposals, and other matters and to participate effectively in discussions of academic and professional matters delineated in Title 5;

Whereas, many California community colleges and districts have satellite campuses but hold governance meetings, trainings, and activities primarily or entirely on their "main" campuses; and

Whereas, the significance of location is an issue of equity for faculty, staff, student, and administrative participation in local senate's governance;

Resolved, that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senates to rotate their senate meetings to include satellite or alternative campuses for their college;

Resolved, that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage the use of technological applications to extend governance access and participation across college campuses when feasible; and

Resolved, that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) add emphasis on significance of location as an issue of equity in shared governance to the appropriate ASCCC documents, including the *Local Senates Handbook*.

Contact: Dolores Davison, Foothill College, Area B

## **19.0 PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS**

### **19.01 S18 Faculty Involvement in Responding to Litigation or Student Complaints**

Whereas, Education Code §70902 (b)(7) ensures the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards;

Whereas, Title 5 §53200 includes grading policies and standards or policies regarding student preparation and success as areas in which a college district must rely primarily or reach mutual agreement with the local academic senate based on local policy;

Whereas, Changes in policy or procedures that are initiated in response to legal action regarding civil rights claims, disabled student accommodations, student complaints over grading procedures, or other academic or professional matters may impact the ability of faculty to uphold the academic and professional standards around student preparation and academic rigor; and

Whereas, Faculty can respect the confidentiality and sensitive nature of litigation and student complaints while maintaining their purview in areas of academic standards;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage colleges to respect their collegial consultation process and involve the academic senate and discipline faculty in the development or revision of policies and procedures relevant to all areas of academic and professional matters when responding to legal action regarding civil rights claims, disabled student accommodations, student complaints over grading procedures, or other academic or professional matters that may impact the ability of faculty to uphold the academic and professional standards around student preparation and academic rigor.

Contact: Executive Committee

### **19.02 S18 Defining Collegiality in the Workplace**

Whereas, Concern that the lack of collegiality and incivility has negatively impacted the morale and health of faculty leading to collective bargaining agreement provisions allowing for investigation and mediation to resolve non-collegiality issues, e.g., Article 5 of Los Angeles Community College District/AFT Faculty Guild Collective Bargaining Agreement;

Whereas, Even though the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges efforts have advanced the practice of collegial consultation, collective bargaining agreement provisions addressing a lack of workplace collegiality may remain underutilized in the absence of a clear definition of “collegiality” and a thorough description of practicable and observable ways to implement collegiality as a shared responsibility among colleagues toward a common purpose;

Whereas, The Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges adopted Resolution 06.02 (S92) on collegiality out of concern whether “respect for faculty and collegiality in general” were advanced following the passage of AB 1725 (Vasconcellos, 1988), and, since that time, has provided guidance to local senates on advancing professional conduct, e.g., *Faculty as Professionals: Responsibilities, Standards and Ethics* (2002), and on improving collegial consultation, e.g., in collaboration with the Community College League of California, *Participating Effectively in District and College Governance* (1998); and

Whereas, Research has shown that the broader notion of collegiality in a professional workplace is a misunderstood ideal or “a complex and somewhat ‘slippery’ idea that features in academic leadership literature in a variety of, sometimes contradictory, ways”,<sup>19</sup>

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges develop a paper by fall 2019 plenary that defines what collegiality in the workplace means for community college faculty, reviews the best practices in the promotion of a collegial workplace, and provides guidance to faculty on facilitating collegial relationships.

Contact: Jeffrey Hernandez, East Los Angeles College, Area C

---

<sup>19</sup> Giedre Kligyte & Simon Barrie (2014) Collegiality: leading us into fantasy – the paradoxical resilience of collegiality in academic leadership, *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33:1, 157-169, DOI: [10.1080/07294360.2013.864613](https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2013.864613) See also Shin Freedman, "Collegiality Matters: How Do We Work With Others?" (2009). Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284314771>



**Academic Senate**  
for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

**President**

*Julie Bruno*  
*Sierra College*

April 5, 2018

**Vice President**

*John Stanskas*  
*San Bernardino Valley College*

Dear Colleagues,

**Secretary**

*Dolores Davison*  
*Foothill College*

The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges accepted the resignation of its Executive Director, Dr. Julie Adams, after twenty-one years of service with our organization. During Julie's tenure with the ASCCC, the organization grew from a volunteer organization with one employee in 1997, to an organization with thirteen full-time employees, significantly increasing the organization's capacity to serve as the voice of faculty in the California community colleges in academic and professional matters. Julie was tireless in her dedication to ASCCC as well as to the faculty and students of our colleges and she leaves us in solid condition to carry on with our multi-faceted mission.

**Treasurer**

*John Freitas*  
*Los Angeles City College*

**Area A Representative**

*Ginni May*  
*Sacramento City College*

**Area B Representative**

*Conan McKay*  
*Mendocino College*

**Area C Representative**

*Rebecca Eikey*  
*College of the Canyons*

The Executive Committee expresses its heartfelt appreciation to Julie for her commitment and service to the Academic Senate and we wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

**Area D Representative**

*Craig Rutan*  
*Santiago Canyon College*

Respectfully,

**North Representative**

*Cheryl Aschenbach*  
*Lassen College*

Julie Bruno

President

**North Representative**

*Carrie Roberson*  
*Butte College*

**South Representative**

*Randy Beach*  
*Southwestern College*

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

**South Representative**

*Lorraine Slattery-Farrell*  
*Mt. San Jacinto College*

**Representative at Large**

*Sam Foster*  
*Fullerton College*

**Representative at Large**

*LaTonya Parker*  
*Moreno Valley College*



## Committees for 2018-2019

### Academic Review – 4 FT Faculty

Steve Crossman (2018), Catherine Indermill (2018),  
Cintya Da Cruz (2019), Deborah White (2019)

### Accreditation Steering – 1 Senator, 1 FT Faculty

Alicia Mendoza (2018)  
Conan McKay (2019)

### Academic Senate – Must have two semesters, should be tenured

Jason Edington (2018), Catherine Indermill (2018), Doug Browe (2018), Nicholas Petti (2018),  
Rachel Donham (2018), Conan McKay (2018)  
Rodney Grisanti (2019), Rhea Hollis (2019)

### Curriculum – 5 FT Faculty, 1 FT Faculty Chair – Must have two semesters, should be tenured

Julie Finnegan (2018), Marcus Frederickson (2018),  
Reid Edelman (2019), Tanja Ramming (2019), Sarah Walsh (2019), Tascha Whetzel (Chair-2019),

### Distance Ed – 5 FT Faculty

Phil Warf (2018), Bart Rawlinson (2018), Catherine McKay (2018),  
Conan McKay (2019), Casey Terrill (2019), Tanja Ramming (2019), David Pai (2019)

### EAP – In addition to Senate President and Curriculum Chair, SLO Chair, DE Chair, 1 from Curr, and 1 at large, : Must have two semesters, should be tenured

Vacant (2020) – should be from curriculum

### EMC – 5 FT Faculty, 1 FT Faculty Co-Chair

Roger Hock (2018), Marcus Fredrickson (2018), Conan McKay (Co-Chair 2018)  
Reid Edelman (2019), Steve Hixenbaugh (2019), Lisa Rosenstreich (2019)

### Equity – 5 FT Faculty, 1 FT Faculty Co-Chair

Alicia Mendoza (2018), Maria Cetto (2018),  
Steve Crossman (2019), Nicholas Petti (2019), Lidia Sanchez (2019)  
Need: Faculty Co-Chair (2019)

### Facilities – 2 FT Faculty

Jim Xerogeanes (2018),  
Steve Cardimona (2019)

### **Faculty Association**

Rhea Hollis (2018),  
Tim Beck (2019)

### **Faculty Office Space – 4 FT Faculty**

Deborah White (2018), Greg Hicks (2018),  
Phil Warf (2019), Reid Edelman (2019)

### **Flex – 3 FT Faculty**

Jody Gehrman (2018),  
Leslie Banta (2019), Roger Hock (2019)

### **Foundational Skills – 5 FT Faculty, 1 FT Faculty Chair**

Ginny Buccelli (Chair-2018), Roger Ahders (2018), Conan McKay (2018), Alicia Mendoza (2018),  
Maria Cetto (2019),

Need one replacement through 2019

### **Outreach and Marketing – 3 FT Faculty**

Steve Hixenbaugh (2018),  
Nicholas Petti (2019), Lidia Sanchez (2019)

### **PPAC – AS President and Vice President**

Jason Edington (2018), Phil Warf (2018)

### **Professional Development – AS President, 1 FT Faculty**

Jason Edington (2018),  
Roger Hock (2019)

### **Professional Leave – 3 FT Faculty – Tenured Faculty, not applying**

Roger Hock (2018),  
Tim Beck (2019), Sarah Walsh (2019)

### **SLOT – 5 FT Faculty, 1 Faculty Chair**

Dan Jenkins (Chair – 2018), Doug Boswell (2018), Casey Terrill (2018),  
Doug Browe (2019), Conan McKay (2019), Brianna Zuber (2019)

### **Staffing – 5 FT Faculty – Minimum of three years employment with district**

Rodney Grisanti (2018), Lisa Rosenstreich (2018),  
Bart Rawlinson (2019), Greg Hicks (2019), Jody Gehrman (2019)

### **Technology – 3 FT Faculty**

Sue Blundell (2018), David Pai (2018),  
Stephen Decker (2019), Doug Browe (2019)